

REMARKS

The above-identified patent application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 7, 2006 (herein “the Office Action”), a one-month’s extension of time being transmitted herewith. In the Office Action, Claims 25 – 27 remain allowed; Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 11, 13, 14, 16, 18 – 24, 28 – 33, 35 – 43, 45 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Number 4,310,726 to Asmuth in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,893,325 to Pankonen; Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Number 4,310,726 to Asmuth in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,893,325 to Pankonen and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,076,028 to Donnelly; Claims 15, 17 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Number 4,310,726 to Asmuth in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,893,325 to Pankonen and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,847,824 to Contractor; Claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Number 4,310,726 to Asmuth in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,893,325 to Pankonen and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,289,083 B1 to Ray; and Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Number 4,310,726 to Asmuth in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,893,325 to Pankonen and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,506,897 to Moore.

In response thereto and without intending to abandon or to dedicate to the public any patentable subject matter, Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 28, 31, 32, 37 and 39 have been amended and Claims 14 – 24 and 38 have been cancelled. Claims 25-27 stand allowed. Therefore, **Claims 1 – 13, 25 – 37 and 39 – 46 and are currently pending.** As set forth more fully below, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims are respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to emergency telephone services, and in particular, to the routing of emergency services calls from call centers to public safety answering points and to the provision of data in connection with such calls. This invention enables an emergency service call center to route a call or request for emergency services automatically

to a public safety answering point proximal to the caller and provide the PSAP with pertinent information (e.g., latitude and longitude, street address, vehicle collision data, etc.) related to the caller. In addition, the present invention allows the use of the public switched telephone network to deliver the emergency service calls received by an emergency service call center to an appropriate PSAP and to have the call treated as any other 9-1-1 call (*i.e.*, as a native 9-1-1 call).

Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 11, 13, 14, 16, 18 – 24, 28 – 33, 35 – 43, 45 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Number 4,310,726 to Asmuth (herein “*Asmuth*”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,893,325 to Pankonen (herein “*Pankonen*”). Of this claim set, claims 14, 16, 18 – 24 and 38 have been canceled. All of the remaining independent claims stand rejected under these references. It is respectfully asserted that Applicants’ independent claims, as amended, include limitations that are not found in the prior art. Further, Applicants respectfully assert that *Asmuth* and *Pankonen* cannot be properly combined.

**Claim 1** Claim 1 specifically includes the limitations of:

associating a first routing number with said first request for emergency services, wherein said first routing number is operable to route said first request for emergency services to a switch associated with said first emergency service zone; [and]

associating a first request identifier with said first request for emergency services, wherein said first request identifier uniquely identifies said first request for emergency services and wherein said first request identifier uniquely identifies a first one of said plurality of public safety answering points associated with said first emergency service zone;

Claim 1, lines 7 – 13.

Neither *Asmuth* nor *Pankonen* disclose or suggest using a **first routing number** and a **first request identifier** to route the call. *Asmuth* discloses using **only one** pseudo-telephone number to route the call to a local public safety answering point (PSAP) and then retrieve the real telephone number of the calling telephone. *Asmuth* uses one pseudo-telephone number to direct the call to the PSAP (first three digits or office code) and as a retrieval key (last four digits). *Pankonen* only uses the ANI of the calling telephone to route

the call and thus does not use a pseudo-telephone number at all. Thus, *Asmuth* and *Pankonen* specifically teach away from using two numbers.

Applicants claim using a first routing number to direct the call to a switch and then using the first request identifier to select a PSAP connected to the switch and then as a retrieval key. Neither the system of *Asmuth* nor *Pankonen* can be used, for example, to route an emergency call from a call center in one state to a PSAP in another state. Further, both *Asmuth* and *Pankonen* are silent as to how a mobile call could possibly be handled. Both *Asmuth* and *Pankonen* assume that the call is coming from a local landline telephone to be delivered to a local PSAP and hence do not teach or suggest routing a call to a switch using a routing number. In Applicants' claimed system, the entire network does not have to be reprogrammed to recognize the office code (as in *Asmuth*, Col. 7, lines 51 - 58); the call is routed just like any other telephone call.

As stated in Applicants' previous amendment, Claim 1 recites receiving location information. *Asmuth* does not disclose receipt of location information. The Examiner responded to this argument by combining *Pankonen* with *Asmuth*, stating that "*Pankonen* discloses integrated public safety answering point that provides location information for emergency service... ." Office Action, Page 3, first paragraph. Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner's reading of *Pankonen* is incorrect. Applications can find no mention of "location" as in geographic location *per se*. Instead, the passage of *Pankonen* cited in the Office Action reads, in pertinent part:

When ALI data is returned, the Control Module 30 associates the data with a particular position through the ANI embedded in the ALI record. Col. 5, lines 29 – 30 (emphasis added)

"Position" in this context of *Pankonen* means the operator position, not a location. See, e.g., Col. 4 lines 59 – 68, wherein it is stated that "each position is provisioned with an individual dedicated two-wire voice link between the SCX 12 and each Console in the PSAP 14." Applicants can find no reference to "location" as geographic location anywhere in

*Pankonen*. Thus, the combination of *Asmuth* and *Pankonen* do not teach or suggest Applicants' limitation of receiving a location. For this reason alone, Applicants' Claim 1 is not obvious over the combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen*.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that *Asmuth* and *Pankonen* cannot be properly combined. *Asmuth* uses the first three digits of pseudo-telephone number to route the call and then uses the last four as a key into a database to retrieve the real ANI. *Pankonen* relies on the ANI to associate an operator position with an ALI record. These two references use two different means for passing ANI information and therefore are incompatible. Thus, these two references are not combinable.

**Claims 2 – 11 and 13** Inasmuch as the combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* does not disclose each and every element of the invention as set forth in Claim 1, and is not operable as the claimed invention, it likewise does not disclose each and every element of the invention set forth in any of Claims 2 – 11 and 13 which depend from Claim 1, nor is the combination of *Asmuth* and *Pankonen* operable as the inventions recited in Claims 2 – 11 and 13.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claims 1 – 11 and 13 are not obvious over *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* and the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claim 28** As noted above, the combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* does not disclose or suggest obtaining location information related to a request for emergency services. Further, the combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* does not disclose or suggest "a first routing number" and "a first unique identifier." *Asmuth* and *Pankonen* only use one number for routing and identification purposes. Additionally, *Asmuth* and *Pankonen* do not disclose or suggest that the first unique identifier includes an identification of a third network node. Therefore, the combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* cannot render Claim 28 obvious.

**Claims 29 – 31** Inasmuch as the combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* does not disclose or suggest each and every element of the invention as set forth in Claim 28, and is not operable as the claimed invention, the combination likewise does not disclose each and every element of the invention set forth in any of Claims 29-31 which depend from Claim 29, nor is the combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* operable as the invention recited in Claims 29 – 31.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claims 28 – 31 are not anticipated by *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen*, and the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claim 32** As noted above, the combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* does not teach or suggest location information, but rather, they use a directory number, i.e., the identity of a calling station, not its location. Consequently, *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* cannot and does not disclose “store first information regarding a location” as recited in Claim 32. Nor does *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* disclose a “query comprising the first information regarding the location from which the first request for emergency services originated” being transmitted by the call center system. Further, *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* does not disclose both a first identifier and a second identifier as recited in Claim 32, or associating said second identifier “as a calling number.” Finally, *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* does not disclose or suggest that the second identifier comprises a public safety answering point identifier. Thus, Claim 32 cannot be obvious over *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen*.

**Claims 33, 35 and 36** Inasmuch as the combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* does not disclose or suggest each and every element of the invention as set forth in Claim 32, and is not operable as the claimed invention, the combination likewise does not disclose each and every element of the invention set forth in any of Claims 33, 35 and 36 which depend

from Claim 32, nor is the combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* operable as the invention recited in Claims 33, 35 and 36.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claims 32, 33, 35 and 36 are not obvious over *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* and the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claim 37** As noted above, the combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* does not teach or suggest using the location of a communication device for any purpose, as recited in Claim 37. Therefore, the combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* does not disclose or suggest “determining the geographic location of the communication device” as recited in Claim 37, nor does the combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* disclose or suggest correlating that geographic location to a public safety answering point, also as recited in Claim 37. The combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* does not disclose or suggest the use of an “identification key” that is associated with a “public safety answering point” as recited in Claim 37, and does not disclose or suggest “providing geographic location information to the public safety answering point over a second communication network.” Therefore, independent Claim 37 is not obvious over *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen*.

**Claims 39 – 43, 45 and 46** Inasmuch as the combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* does not disclose or suggest each and every element of the invention as set forth in Claim 37, and is not operable as the claimed invention, it likewise does not disclose each and every element of the invention set forth in any of Claims 38-46 which depend from Claim 37, nor is the combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* operable as the invention recited in Claims 39 – 43, 45 and 46.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claims 37, 39 – 43, 45 and 46 are not obvious over *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claim 12** stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* and further in view of US Patent Number 6,076,028 to *Donnelly et al.* (herein “*Donnelly*”). For the reasons stated above with respect to Claims 1 and 11, the combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* fails to disclose each and every element of the invention as set forth in Claims 1 and 11, and therefore fails to disclose each and every element of the invention set forth in Claim 12, which depends from Claims 1 and 11.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claim 12 is not obvious over *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* and *Donnelly*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 12 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claims 15, 17 and 44** stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,847,824 to *Contractor* (herein “*Contractor*”). Claims 15 and 17 have been cancelled. For the reasons stated above with respect to Claim 37, the combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* fails to disclose each and every element of the invention as set forth in Claim 37, and therefore fails to disclose each and every element of the invention set forth in Claim 44, which depends from Claim 37.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claim 44 is not obvious over *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* and *Contractor*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 44 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claim 34** stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,289,083 *Ray* (herein “*Ray*”). For the reasons stated above with respect to Claims 32 and 33, the combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* fails to disclose each and every element of the invention as set forth in Claims 32 and 33, and therefore fails to disclose each and every element of the invention set forth in Claim 34, which depends from Claims 32 and 33.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claim 34 is not obvious over *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* and *Ray*. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 34 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claim 4** stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,506,897 to Moore *et al.* (herein “*Moore*”). For the reasons stated above with respect to Claim 1, the combination of *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* fails to disclose each and every element of the invention as set forth in Claim 1, and therefore fails to disclose each and every element of the invention set forth in Claim 4, which depends from Claim 1.

There is no suggestion in either of the cited references to combine their teachings. Moreover, modifying *Asmuth*, *Pankonen* or both to perform a point-in-polygon lookup would yield a nonfunctional result, inasmuch as a point-in-polygon lookup requires location information, but neither *Asmuth* nor *Pankonen* disclose location information. As discussed above, both *Asmuth* and *Pankonen* disclose use of a directory number, not location information. Therefore, not only is there no suggestion in either of the cited references for combining the teachings of the cited references, the teachings are in-fact, not combinable.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claim 4 is not obvious over *Asmuth* in view of *Pankonen* and *Moore*. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 4 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claims 25-27 stand allowed** over the prior art of record.

*Application No.: 10/809,783  
Atty. Docket No.: 4380-2-CON  
June 29, 2006  
Page 19 of 19*

The application now appearing to be in form for allowance, early notification of same is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if doing so would expedite the resolution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael B. Johannesen/  
Michael B. Johannesen  
1601 Dry Creek Drive  
Longmont, Colorado 80503

Telephone: (630) 300-2727 or (630) 430-1502

Date: June 29, 2006